

Christopher Simmler

7005 Wheat Mill Place, Raleigh, NC 27613 ▲ Similar@Gloryroad.net ▲ Telephone: 919.939.9090

September 4, 2008

Mr. Shyam Sunder
Lead Investigator
National Institute of Safety and Standards
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 1070
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1070

REFERENCE: This 3 page document on NIST NCSTAR1A and video on “Why the Building Fell.”

Mr. Sunder:

I’ve recently reviewed the above referenced video and report. A document used to establish belief in post hoc reasoning is dubious from the start. The conclusion that building materials’ exposure to heat caused WTC 7’s inevitable demise is possibly the second to last chance to dispel the controlled demolition that everyone clearly recognized here, *if not in the other two ‘because of jets and fuel.’*

The third building to fall that day, WTC 7 had no impact or jet fuel to catalyze, or explain, its annihilation. It looked like a duck, but the report professes it was really a goose: That recognized by most to be controlled demolition, with warning, is professed to be *happenstance*.

The familiar precision and complete demolishment is *absent random result* and invariably part of a greater plan that included 2 of 4 jets, if not perhaps a distinguishable fraud.

The truth of that day, with thousands dead since, is material to the course of world events. Ten percent may be an appropriate number for the third building as we look to a people that still tithe.

That tax resources are devoted to “proving” something other than what many recognize to be demolition makes this citizen curious as to whether or not insurance would have covered the third building had it been a total loss due to “demolition.” Perhaps a newly obsolete building would have been covered. Either way, tax dollars should not be used to protect the potentially corrupt, even if in an effort to alleviate the government of alleged culpability.

A. CLAIMING AN INABILITY TO DETECT EXPLOSIVES BY SOUND WITNESSES FAILS TO INVALIDATE THE OBSERVATION OF A DEMOLITION.

Perhaps the public has not witnessed suppressed explosives used in a public demolition, *or any by aircraft*. If a tree falls in the forest, and there is other substantial noise or insulation, can it be heard? Could explosions have been sufficiently muffled, although seismic? Were people forced to work with explosives in their building, or can a crew do *its* work in 7 hours and not cool the flames? “Pull’ this.”

The report’s reasoning that an estimated 130-decibel explosion @ 1/2 mile should have been heard overlooks the 130-decibel sirens, and other chaos, in the matter of white noise. One respectfully begs to differ that demolition can only be performed with explosives that “had to be heard,” as you claim SEISMOGRAPH readings support a post hoc computer-supported theory of rushing girder and cement floor collapse, *and no audible evidence of detonation*.

The enclosed video, in conjunction with your video clip, demonstrates there was a 6 to 8 second delay between commencement of Building 7’s demise (as identified by east roof collapse in your video) and the time this videographer hurriedly arrived at the window for the remainder of the fall.

Please advise which cue the video recorder followed had the demolition not been marked by discernable sound, seismograph record, or quiet quake.

B. INCONCLUSIVE FLAMES AND DURATION OF EXPOSURE.

Furthermore, the data is materially lacking. As materials experts know, the report’s basis relies on a purported intensity of, exposure to, and duration of heat. Of other significant consideration is area.

The conclusion is supported with a hypothetical computer generated simulation, figure 3.6, indicating a moving fire over time, increasing in size, sustaining temperatures @ 1000 *Centigrade* at the core; none greater than 2 hours in duration, as it was outwardly clear no one floor was engulfed in flames, especially on the east side.

There is little evidence, if any, to support whole steel beam/column immersion, or necessary exposure, that led to complete and replicable failure on sequential floors. For argument’s sake, any floor subjected to enough intensity and duration of heat to collapse would have fallen in a random manner upon the stationary floor below.

That lower floor would then absorb the transfer of weight until, and if, it exceeded its maximum load; slowing the process, not facilitating it. Then the lower floor would fall in its *random and incomplete* fashion, beginning at the most compromised or weighted areas, slowed and suspended by various bolts, rivets, rebar, trusses, girders, and other available safety materials, ensuring a decreased weight for the following floor; should one have existed.

Perhaps one is to believe that these buildings were not designed in the 1980s to withstand collapse. Isn't the art of demolition precisely exploiting the regions designed to prevent or allow collapse? The report also suggests new concern for building safety. I doubt any building codes will prevent events similar to those that transpired on and after 9/11.

CONCLUSION

Creating a computer image to prove enough floors failed in order for form/column 79 to also fail is wishful thinking. As powerful as the computers used to create this simulation may have been, such a measure fails to support the accuracy or truthfulness in their creations. Certainly, computer imaging relies on the intent and design of the programmer.

Form 79 appears to be within reach of the concealed substation, and everyone recognized the critical piece that collapsed first. The report fails to rule out demolition.

Certainly, truth and common belief in matters may vary. To ask one to believe the unmistakable appearance of a skilled demolition was simply a random, precise occurrence is an exercise in blind faith, supported with post hoc reasoning and invalid evidence.

The precision and utter annihilation that was the result of *no* jet impact carries an undeniably reasonable explanation. The matter is clear, as you and yours attempt to manufacture the preponderance of evidence, if not that which is best manufactured to be clear and convincing.

One would hate to think another could be evil enough to kill thousands for any reason, let alone ensure the plan is carried through. This apparently is the world in which we live, no matter who safely takes the credit, or actually may be to blame.

However, safely acquiring generous profits on a recently obsolete and adjacent property was a viable opportunity, even if one was not responsible for the demise of the previous two, or the loss of innocent life. Business is business at the end of the day, and deception may be profitable... for a season.

Best regards,